

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 are pending.

The present application pertains to a method and device for clamping rotationally symmetrical bodies. An exemplary device of Figs. 6 and 7 includes a tie rod 64 which provides a tensile force  $F_1$  to a body 10, and a supporting element 72 which provides a spring force  $F_2$  to the body 10 counteracting the tensile force. However, the invention is not limited to the disclosed embodiments.

Claim 1 is rejected as being anticipated by Morawski.

Claim 1 recites a method of clamping a rotationally symmetrical body which includes, among other features, pulling the body by a tensile force which acts on a first side of the body, against a supporting element having a centering effect, wherein the supporting element is acted upon with a spring force which is opposed to the tensile force, the spring force is slightly smaller than the tensile force and is proportioned in such a way that, when the body strikes the supporting element, the supporting element yields in the axial direction.

Morawski discloses a collet chuck for tapered workpieces W including spring-biased slides 60 and 62, a stop ring 102, and a puller shaft 22 on which is mounted a collet sleeve 38 having fingers 44 which cooperate with a bushing 50. As discussed in column 2, lines 38-68 of Morawski, the workpiece is first moved rearward against the stop ring, during which the slides 60 and 62 cooperate to center the workpiece W. Then, as discussed in column 3, lines 1-12 of Morawski, the puller shaft 22 is retracted which causes the fingers 44 to move rearward and outward over the

bushing 50 so as to clamp the workpiece W between the fingers 44 and the stop ring 102.

In the rejection, the Examiner appears to interpret the puller shaft 22 as constituting an element which pulls a body by a tensile force. This is not so. Specifically, the puller shaft 22 does not provide a tensile force to the workpiece W, not does it providing a pulling force to the workpiece W. Instead, as discussed above, when the puller shaft 22 is retracted, the fingers 44 move rearward and outward over the bushing 50 and clamp the workpiece W between the fingers 44 and the ring 102. Clearly, such clamping by the fingers 44 is not a tensile force provided to the workpiece W and does not pull the workpiece W. Thus, Morawski does not disclose a method of clamping a rotationally symmetrical body which includes pulling the body by a tensile force which acts on a first side of the body, in combination with the other features recited in Claim 1.

Claim 1 is therefore allowable over Morawski, and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 is also rejected as being anticipated by Morawski.

Claim 7 recites a device for clamping a rotationally symmetrical body including, among other features, a tie rod which is mounted in the device in such a way that it can act on the body axially, a tensile force of the tie rod being adjustable, and having a supporting element, against which the rotationally symmetrical body to be clamped can be pulled by the tie rod, wherein the supporting element is supported in a spring-loaded manner on a stop of the device in such a way that it is movable in the axial direction of the body to be clamped, the spring force counteracting the tensile force.

The Examiner asserts that Morawski's puller shaft 22 constitutes a tie rod. Assuming some basis exists for this assertion, Claim 7 is clearly distinguishable. Specifically, as discussed above, the puller shaft 22 does not pull the workpiece W. Thus, Morawski does not disclose a device for clamping a rotationally symmetrical body which includes a tie rod and a supporting element against which the rotationally symmetrical body to be clamped can be pulled by the tie rod, in combination with the other features recited in Claim 7.

Claim 7 is therefore also allowable over Morawski, and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 7 is also respectfully requested.

The dependent claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims. The dependent claims also recite further distinguishing aspects of the clamping apparatus and method at issue here. For example, new Claim 16 recites that the supporting element is supported in a spring-loaded manner on a stop, and the centering device is immovably fixed to the stop.

Early and favorable action with respect to this application is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful

in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: December 2, 2008

By: Peter T. deVore  
Patrick C. Keane  
Registration No. 32,858

Peter T. deVore  
Registration No. 60,361

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620